G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000–20 12 13

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1898–99
~~191~~ .
(Murrai)

File No. 124

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

*Month*_____

SUBJECT.

Warning the Parpathegar of the Sri Ranganathaswami Temple at Kanthanthelli for being unpopular with the devotees.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES	LATER REFERENCES

1898-99

No 995 Encl

No: 2001

Name and address of Petr

Date of Arzi 14.6.97.

Date of Receipt 30.6.97

No of enclosure

The accompanying petn No: 2001 dated 14th June 1897, received at the Dewan's office from Gundappa & other Dharmadarsies of the temples at Kankanhalli, praying that the Poinpathegen's place may be abolished in the Ranganathaswamy temple & 2 Swamys appointed instead is forwarded to the

Dy Commr, Bangalore District, for favr/ info

B.O. as

Abstract

From the Dewan No 4/134 dt 1/7/97

16/9/01

2001 ಸೆಪ್ಟೆಂಬರ್ 20

ಸೇವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ

ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಮಿಷನರ್ ಸಾಹೇಬರು
ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಮಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲು ಬಯಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿಯ ಕಂದಾಯ ಗ್ರಾಮವಾದ ಹೊಸಪೇಟೆಯ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ. 45 ರಲ್ಲಿ 2 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸುಮಾರು 30 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಭವಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪಹಣಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರು ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಪಹಣಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಹೆಸರು ಬರಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಕೋರಿಕೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಸಹಿ

ಹೆಸರು: ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಬಿನ್ ಲೇ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ
ವಿಳಾಸ: ಹೊಸಪೇಟೆ, ಕಸಬಾ ಹೋಬಳಿ
ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

1895/99

From

The Dy. Commissioner, of the Bangalore District.



To The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Muzrai Department

Dated 20th May 1899

Despatched 23rd May 1899

Received

General No.
D No. 1134

Enclosure No. 1 file

Secretary's Official Memo: No. 995 dated 5th February 1898 -

States that no valid reason appears for the abolition of the place of parpattegar in the Rama = = nathaswami temple and that if two sweepers are wanted the petitioner &c might encourage the devotees to subscribe to meet the cost

the same no 1322 dy 8/6/99

D. C. No 1131/1
Sa. File

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 20th March 1899.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

Sir,

In reply to your official memo No 995 dated 5th February 1898, forwarding a petition from Gundappa and other Dharmadarsees of the temple at Kankanhalli for my opinion in the matter of abolishing the place of parpathegar in the Ranganathaswami temple and entertaining two sweepers instead, I have the honor to state that, as reported by the Amildar, the petitioners desire this change with a view to get rid of the present parpathegar who, on his claims being established, was ordered in February 1897, to take charge of the place from one Naveenum Gopalachar who seems to have obtained the good graces of the petitioners when he acted for the place for about a year and a half from 21st August 1895. The appeal of Gopalachar to Government against the Deputy Commissioner's order was rejected, vide your endorsement No 692 dated 4th February 1899 to the petitioner, copy of which was received in this office with

with c/o 693 dated 4th February 1899
The parpathegar of the temple does not enjoy any Inam land nor does he get any Ready money grant from Government in return for his services to the temple. He and the other servants of the temple are paid out of the interest on the temple Puduvat. Since the place is a long standing one and it is evident that the petitioners pray for this change merely because the present incumbent is not a persona grata with them, I see no valid reason for the abolition of the place. If two sweepers are wanted, the petitioners might encourage the devotees to subscribe a sufficient sum to meet the cost.

2. The records connected with the appointment of the present incumbent and the petition received with your Memo are, herein, enclosed for reference

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

H P Hattangadi

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

MUZRAI

189

From

To The Deputy Comr,
Bangalore Dt.

Dated 8th
Despatched 9th June 1899
Received
General No. 1322
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No. 1 File 4/4

His letter No. 1134 dated 20th May 1899, stating with refee to this office memo No. 995 dated 5th Feb 1898, that it is not necessary to abolish the place of Parpattegar in the Sri Ranganatha-Swamie temple at Kanakanahalli.

Recorded with the remark that the Parpatte-gar who is remunerated ~~from the interest~~ for his

work from the interest
derived from the Padavat
funds of the temple may
be allowed to continue in his office
as recommended
by the Dy Comr. ~~The present~~ But the
S. Pappettigar ~~however~~ seems
to have made himself very obnoxious by his conduct
to the Shavm adavees of the temple and the
Dy Comr is therefore requested
to warn him against ~~such~~
so behaving himself in future.

2. The enclosures to the
letter under advertance
are herewith retd.

B. O.

Asst Secretary